

THE FARM LABOR SITUATION IN OHIO

Department of Rural Economics and Rural Sociology
Mimeograph Bulletin No. 157

Ohio State University
and
Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station
Columbus, Ohio
December, 1942

This study of the farm labor situation in Ohio was undertaken at the request of the State Agricultural War Board.

The report is based upon information secured from several sources. A field study was made in areas in 16 counties of the State. About five hundred farmers were interviewed and a schedule filled out. A schedule was mailed by County Agricultural Agents to 14,000 farm community leaders; approximately 3,500 of these schedules were returned. Reports were received from 65 County Agricultural Labor Committees stating their appraisal and views as to the labor situation. Sales of farm chattels advertised in 32 daily or weekly papers were counted. Data were drawn from the United States Census, the Crop Reporting Service and other sources. Many interviews were held with individuals and agencies in touch with the labor situation.

Thanks are also due to Mr. Guy Dowdy and Mr. Jesse Amsbaugh of the Land Use Planning unit of the Agricultural Extension Service for assistance throughout the study.

Department of
Rural Economics and Rural Sociology
Ohio State University
Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary and Recommendations	1
Some Facts Mainly from the Census	4
The Farm Labor Situation in Ohio.	6
Dairy Production.	17
Analysis of Farm Auction Sales.	19
County Farm Labor Committee Suggestions	19
The United States Employment Service.	23
High School Students as a Source of Farm Labor.	25
Reserve Labor Supply Among Aged People in Ohio.	29
WPA Employees as a Source of Farm Labor	31

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

1. Farmers planned their 1942 production in anticipation of good prices. They will plan their 1943 production in anticipation of labor shortage.
2. Our high crop production in 1942 was to a considerable extent due to the weather, and our high livestock numbers to good crops in 1941 and 1942.
3. The replies would indicate that agricultural production in 1943 will not exceed that of 1942, assuming equally good weather, and that if the present movement of labor from the farm continues, production will be less.
4. With a net loss of 8 per cent in manpower in 1942, the farm labor problem has become critical, particularly since about September 1.
5. The survey showed that from October, 1941, to October, 1942, there was a net loss of 23 per cent in the number of male family workers between the ages of 18 and 45 years and a loss of 36 per cent in the number of regular hired men. These losses were in part made up by the labor of women, children and elderly people.
6. Of the total labor on Ohio farms the operator normally provides one-half, other family labor one-fourth, and hired labor one-fourth.
7. Many farm operators who normally employ full-time men have no extra housing facilities for hired men with families. They have employed their own sons or unmarried men, who lived with the operator. Now that single men have gone to the armed services or to industry, a larger proportion of the available hired labor supply is composed of married men with families. This raises a serious housing problem.
8. Ten per cent of Ohio farms normally produce 40 per cent of the farm products sold. These are the farms that employ the most labor and on which the loss of labor would most severely curtail output. These large farms indicated a probable decrease in production in 1943.
9. The smaller farms have more manpower in proportion to output than the larger farms.
10. Doubtless many of the operators of the smaller and less productive farms of the State would be more productive working on larger farms or in industry.
11. One-third of the farm operators of the State now work off the farm.
12. In 1942 the net loss of farm workers to industry was about two-thirds as great as that to the armed services. About two and one-half times as many farmers' sons went into the service as left for industry, while equal numbers of regular hired men went to each.
13. Farm labor needs might be divided into two classes: (a) that for seasonal labor and (b) that for regular year around labor.
14. There was evidence of a lack of advanced planning on the part of farmers and other agencies as to the labor needs.

Recommendations

1. The recent changes in selective service regulations should be of help in preventing further depletion of manpower on the farms. However, the drain to industry will continue unless means are provided for controlling it.
2. Any freezing of farm labor at once brings up the question of the relative wage level in agriculture and in industry.
3. Those farmers who are not now producing to the full capacity of their manpower should be encouraged to do so.
4. The lending of assistance to the transfer of farm workers from the less to the more productive areas should be expanded.
5. Means should be devised to provide housing for more farm labor with families.
6. The United States Employment Service should take steps to make its service more acceptable to agriculture.
7. Plans for the importation of migrant labor should be developed to augment the depleted local supply of seasonal labor in those communities where the shortage will be acute.
8. The schools should make such adjustments in their schedules as will allow the maximum use of farm children in farm work; this should be done with the minimum of sacrifice in educational facilities. This might necessitate a change in the rules for allocating State funds. The most effective adjustment would vary from community to community.
9. High schools in which vocational agriculture is taught should initiate a program for the stimulation of interest in farm work among nonfarm boys, and provide those interested with instruction.
10. The possibilities of stimulating interest in farm work on the part of city school children should be explored. The study would indicate that nonfarm children have been of greatest use when working in groups under supervision.
11. Most of the farm women worked to full capacity in 1942. Plans should be developed to use more nonfarm women in tasks which they can satisfactorily perform.
12. Old age pensioners should be allowed to earn wages for working to their maximum capacity without equivalent sacrifice of pension income.
13. Consideration should be given to the recommendations of the Ohio Cannery Association that, for the duration, there be some relaxation of labor laws applying to the hours minors and women can work.
14. In view of the labor shortage, every farmer should give consideration to methods and practices whereby he can produce the maximum with the minimum of labor. Shortages of new equipment, repairs, fences, etc. will make this increasingly difficult.

15. Every effort should be made to maintain the supply of labor-saving equipment upon which present day agriculture is dependent.
16. It is recommended that farm labor committees in each county make plans for initiating an appraisal of the farm labor needs of the county for the year 1943. Such an appraisal should cover the amount of additional labor needed, when it will be needed, and the nature of the work. With such a statement of farm labor needs, the committee should contact the employment service, the schools, the city business groups and other possible sources of help, and work out plans with them for meeting the situation as best they can. This would enable planning in advance. It would make the plans adaptable to local needs. Some communities, for instance, might want to shorten the school year, others might prefer to shorten the school day. The present county farm labor committees might well serve as the nucleus of such county committees. The neighborhood leaders would be a valuable channel for making the appraisal.

SOME FACTS MAINLY FROM THE CENSUS

(1) Ohio Farm Population.

Ohio Farm Population of Working Age, 1941.

	Number			Per cent		
	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
Total 14 years and over	813,043	439,342	373,701			
14 - 17 years	91,653	38,720	42,933	11.3	11.1	11.5
18 - 19 years	43,561	24,473	19,088	5.4	5.6	5.1
20 - 44 years	334,655	179,507	155,148	41.1	40.8	41.5
45 - 64 years	242,388	129,257	113,131	29.8	29.4	30.3
65 years and over	100,786	57,385	43,401	12.4	13.1	11.6

The above table shows that approximately 30 per cent of the farm population over 14 years of age was between 14 and 19 years of age or over 65 years. This indicates the importance of the young and the old in the farm labor force. The average age of all farm operators was 51 years.

(2) Hired labor.

Approximately one-half of Ohio farms hired no labor in 1939, about 20 per cent hired one or more men the year around. This 20 per cent of the farms produced from 50 to 55 per cent of the total output.

(3) Family labor.

Of 192,000 Ohio farms reporting in the spring of 1940, 90,000 or nearly 50 per cent reported other members of the family taking part in the farm work besides the operator.

(4) Large farms important in production.

Many Ohio farms as listed in the Census are of little significance in contributing to the total volume of agricultural products produced and sold, as indicated in the following table. On the one end, 10 per cent of the farms contribute 40 per cent of the total volume of agricultural products sold. On the other end, the 30 per cent of the farms with the smallest production contribute only 5 per cent of the volume of products sold.

<u>Per cent of farms</u>	<u>Per cent of sales</u>
10	40
25	60
40	75
70	95
100	100

It would probably be safe to say that 50 per cent of Ohio farms produce 85 per cent of the total volume of output. This emphasises the importance of the large

farm units in contributing to the volume of production. It would also indicate that the small farms were not now operated at as near their full capacity as the large farms.

(5) Farm Operators Work Off the Farms.

Of the 233,783 farm operators in Ohio in 1939 over 32 per cent were working at other occupations than that of operating their own farms. The average number of days working off the farm was 162. Of those working off their own farms 20 per cent were working on other farms while 80 per cent were working in industry, trade or the professions. In Summit County 58 per cent of the farm operators were working an average of 232 days off the farm. This would indicate that even before the war a considerable per cent of Ohio farm operators considered other occupations more profitable than that of farming.

(6) Labor Force On Small Farms.

While it is evident that a large portion of our total agricultural production is derived from the larger and better equipped farms, every effort should be made to expand production on the small farms which remain in operation. Though often lacking in skill and equipment these farms have in many instances manpower which is not fully utilized. Where the resources on the farm are too meager to make an effective unit the occupant might well be more productive by seeking employment on other farms or in industry.

(7) Hours of Work.

A survey made by the Federal Government in June, 1942, indicated that the average working week in agriculture was 57.2 hours, in industry 43.8 hours.

(8) Loss of Manpower in Ross County.

A study in Ross County by the Department of Rural Economics and Rural Sociology showed that in October, 1942, of the young men between 20 and 29 years of age who were working on farms two years ago, 50 per cent had left the farms. Of these who had left approximately 60 per cent went to employment other than on the farm while 40 per cent were in military service.

(9) Number in Military Service.

The President recently announced that by the end of 1943 there would be 9,700,000 in military service. This would be an increase of about four million over the present.

THE FARM LABOR SITUATION IN OHIO
As Revealed by a Study in Selected Areas

Two sources of information form the basis for the following part of the report on the farm labor situation:

(1) Records collected by personal interviews in 16 representative Ohio counties, in each of which approximately 30 farms, lying in a solid block, were studied. A total of 477 records were secured. The counties, grouped according to the three major agricultural areas of the State, were as follows:

Western Ohio -- Preble, Pickaway, Champaign, Wyandot, Paulding, Fulton and Ottawa.

Northeastern Ohio -- Lorain, Wayne, Portage, Columbiana and Licking.

Southeastern Ohio -- Harrison, Athens, Lawrence and Brown.

(2) A questionnaire mailed through the various county Agricultural Extension offices to 14,000 neighborhood leaders in the State. Approximately 3,500 of these schedules were returned. Some were not received in time to be included in the study and others were not used because of incomplete or insufficient data.

Less labor available in 1942.— There was approximately 8 per cent less manpower on the 477 farms in 1942 than in 1941 (Table 1). This reduction, which takes into account the relative abilities of the various workers because of age and sex, amounted to 1.8 month of man labor per farm for the year. It does not, however, take account of the longer days spent or the harder physical work performed by the operator or members of his family in 1942.

Table 1.— Months of labor per farm, 477 farms, 16 Ohio counties

Farms reporting			Months		Percentage change from 1941
1941	1942		1941	1942	
473	471	Operator	10.23	9.93	- 2.9
285	301	Family - Women and girls	2.06	2.26	+ 9.7
89	98	" Male, under 18 yrs.	.79	.91	+15.2
27	23	" " 18 to 19.9 yrs.	.34	.31	- 8.9
105	95	" " 20 to 44.9 yrs.	2.41	2.00	-17.0
58	64	" " 45 yrs. & over	.88	.94	+ 6.8
163	151	Hired, regular	4.53	3.44	-24.1
273	289	" seasonal	1.61	1.59	- 1.3
477	477	Total, unweighted	22.85	21.38	- 6.4
		" weighted	22.85	21.06	- 7.8

The reduction in regular hired labor and in male family labor between the ages of 18 and 45 was partially offset by the labor of farm women, farm children of school age, and the older men in the family such as the operator's father. These changes in the relative supply of labor by the various classes of farm workers were found in each of the three sections of the State, although there was a somewhat greater net reduction in southeastern Ohio than in the other areas.

The fact that the average operator spent only about 10 months at farm work is explained by the fact that 107 operators, or 22 per cent of the 477, had outside employment in 1942 (15 per cent in western, 38 per cent in northeastern and 13 per cent in southeastern Ohio). All but two of these continued to do some work on their farms, such as the care of livestock night and morning and field work which could be done when not at their nonfarm occupation.

The importance of family labor.- Approximately one-half of the labor on Ohio farms is performed by the operator, one-fourth by family labor and one-fourth by hired labor (Table 2). In fact, the operator's family contributes more toward the farm labor supply than does hired labor, both regular and seasonal. This is in marked contrast to industry, where all labor is paid wages or salaries. Not all farm operators had family labor at their disposal and only 66 per cent hired any labor at all. Thus, many farmers did all of their work, securing the needed extra help by exchanging work with their neighbors.

Table 2.- Percentage of farm labor supply from different sources,*
16 Ohio counties, by areas, 1941-1942

	Operator	Total	Female	Family labor		Hired labor	
				Under 18	Other	Regular	Seasonal
Western							
1941	46.6	27.9	9.4	4.0	14.5	17.5	8.0
1942	48.0	29.0	10.4	4.8	13.8	15.0	8.0
Northeastern							
1941	40.7	34.2	10.5	3.5	20.2	16.9	8.2
1942	42.0	35.6	12.6	4.2	18.8	13.0	9.4
Southeastern							
1941	46.8	21.8	6.5	2.6	12.7	27.1	4.3
1942	49.6	24.7	8.3	3.4	13.0	21.7	4.0
Total							
1941	44.8	28.4	9.0	3.5	15.9	19.8	7.0
1942	46.4	30.1	10.6	4.3	15.2	16.1	7.4

* Based on months of labor, unweighted as to ability.

More farmers hire seasonal labor.- In 1942 there were nearly twice as many farmers hiring seasonal labor as were hiring men on a regular or monthly basis (Table 3). This is due to the fact that on many farms only seasonal help is needed to supplement the operator and his family labor in such seasons as hay-making, corn harvest, or fruit picking. Another reason is that seasonal labor was often the only kind available, dependable labor that might have been hired on a regular basis having migrated to better paying jobs.

Table 3.- Number and per cent of farms employing hired labor,
16 Ohio areas, 1941 and 1942

	1941		1942	
	Number of farms	Per cent of farms	Number of farms	Per cent of farms
Seasonal labor:				
1 to 10 days	69	14.5	81	17.0
11 to 50 days	116	24.3	127	26.6
51 to 100 days	42	8.8	39	8.2
101 to 200 days	27	5.6	22	4.6
More than 200 days	19	4.0	20	4.2
Total	273	57.2	289	60.6
Regular hired labor:				
0.1 to 3 months	14	2.9	26	5.4
3.1 to 6 months	15	3.1	26	5.4
6.1 to 9 months	16	3.4	20	4.2
9.1 to 12 months	81	17.0	53	11.1
12.1 to 18 months	13	2.7	10	2.1
18.1 to 24 months	13	2.7	9	1.9
More than 24 months	11	2.3	7	1.5
Total	163	34.1	151	31.6
Total hired labor:				
Up to 1 month	82	17.2	97	20.3
1.1 to 3 months	44	9.2	60	12.6
3.1 to 6 months	37	7.8	46	9.6
6.1 to 9 months	16	3.3	20	4.2
9.1 to 12 months	31	6.5	27	5.6
12.1 to 18 months	64	13.4	39	8.2
18.1 to 24 months	12	2.5	11	2.3
24.1 to 36 months	11	2.3	9	1.9
More than 36 months	10	2.1	7	1.5
Total	307	64.3	316	66.2

Thus, in 1942 more farmers hired seasonal labor than in 1941, and fewer of them hired regular labor. It is also of interest to note that more operators hired small amounts of farm labor, both seasonal and regular in 1942, whereas smaller numbers hired the larger amounts, particularly more than 12 months.

Only 46 per cent of all operators hired more than one month of farm labor in 1942, and less than 20 per cent hired more than 9 months total.

Fewer workers on farms than 1 year ago.- An enumeration was made of all regular farm workers, including school children who worked or were capable of working in 1942, but not including seasonal workers such as corn huskers or apple pickers. This showed that 28 of the 477 farms had 1 more worker in October 1942 than a year earlier, 332 farms had the same number of workers, and 117 farms had fewer workers. On the entire group of 477 farms there were 99 fewer workers than there were a year earlier (Table 4). This was a net loss of 1 person for about every 5 farms, or a reduction of 7 per cent in the number of workers.

Table 4.- Total number of farm workers on 477 farms, 16 Ohio counties
and changes in the year October 1941 - October 1942.

	Total October 1941	Left during the year	Came during the year	Total October 1942	Net change	
					No.	Pct.
Operators	476	35	34	475	- 1	-0.2
Family, female	352	22	25	355	+ 3	+0.9
Family, male	334	58	35	311	-23	-6.9
" male under 18	104	11	21	114	+10	+ 9.6
" 18 - 19.9	25	8	2	19	- 6	-24.0
" 20 - 44.9	128	38	9	99	-29	-22.6
" 45 and over	77	1	3	79	+ 2	+ 2.6
Regular hired	214	138	60	136	-78	-36.4
" under 20	14	13	2	3	-11	-78.6
" 20 - 44.9	130	91	33	72	-58	-44.6
" 45 and over	70	34	25	61	- 9	-12.9
Total	1,376	253	154	1,277	-99	-7.2

The farms of the neighborhood leaders lost 6 per cent of their total number of workers. The fact that their farms were 21 per cent larger, providing fuller employment for their sons and hired labor, is cited as explanation for the somewhat smaller labor loss.

Most critical were the declines in the number of male family workers between the ages 18 and 45 years, and in the number of regular hired men. Since these two classes of workers, along with the operator, comprise the group which does the heavy physical work, and since many of these workers helped with spring planting and even hay and small grain harvesting before they left the farms, the situation for the coming year is even more critical than the percentage reduction since October 1941 would at first indicate.

Those who left were not replaced.- A total of 253 regular workers left the 477 farms during the year beginning October 1941, whereas only 154 new workers were recruited (Table 5). More than one-third of all workers who left these 16 areas went to other farms, while more than half of the new workers came from other farms. In this farm migration there was a net loss of only 4 workers on the 477 farms. About 7 workers left for the armed services during the year for every six who left for industrial employment.

On 1,751 farms of neighborhood leaders who provided the information there were 543 regular workers who left during the year, compared with 259 new workers recruited. Thirty-six per cent of those who left went into the armed forces and thirty-three per cent went to industry.

Table 5.- Changes in numbers of farm workers, where they went and whence they came during the year October 1941-October 1942, 477 farms, 16 Ohio counties.

	<u>Operators</u>	<u>Family female</u>	<u>Family, male</u>	<u>Regular hired</u>	<u>Total</u>
Left during year:					
To other farms	28	17	16	31	92
To industry and trade	3*	2	11	42	58
To armed services	1	0	26	41	68
Not working, ill, etc.	0	3	3	10	16
Occupation unknown	0	0	0	9	9
Died	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>10</u>
Total	35	22	58	138	253
Came during year:					
From other farms	19	17	14	38	88
From industry and trade	13	0	5	7	25
From unemployed, etc.**	2	8	16	13	39
From unknown occupation	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>
Total	34	25	35	60	154

* Eleven additional operators secured employment during the year, but continued to work on their farms.

** Includes those not working because too young, old, or ill.

It must be borne in mind that industry began to draw workers away from the farm long before the enactment of the selective service act. Because of some migration of workers from industrial jobs to the farm, the net loss of farm workers to industry (even adding those operators who became part-time farmers during the year) was only about two-thirds as great as numbers who left the farm to enter the armed services in the past year.

In the 16-county study almost 2½ times as many farmers' sons went into the services as left for industry, while equal numbers of regular hired men went to each. On farms of neighborhood leaders, approximately 3 of their sons were inducted for each one who went to industry, while 4 regular hired men went to the armed forces for each 5 to industry.

Both studies indicate that farms suffered a loss not only in total numbers of workers but also in farm experience of these workers. Although there was practically no change in number of farm operators in either study, an analysis of these operators who were interviewed in the 16-county study shows some change in their composition since October, 1941. It will be noted in Table 5 that 13 of the 34 new operators were persons who gave up full-time jobs in town to become either part-time or full-time farmers. In the year a total of 138 regularly hired farm laborers left these 477 farms, as contrasted with 60 who came during the year and only 38 of the latter had been working on other farms. The only source from which these farms gained in net numbers of workers during the year was in a relatively inexperienced group of 39 persons composed of women not working in 1941, children who were too young to work in 1941, and hired men who were on WPA work or idle in 1941 because they were ill or too old to work in industry. The neighborhood leader study showed the same relative loss of experienced farm workers and gain in those who were less experienced and less physically capable. Both studies showed that out of every 10 farmers who had regular hired workers in October, 1941, only 7 had such workers this fall.

How farmers got along with less labor in 1942.- In spite of the above mentioned reductions in the farm labor supply, 222 of these 477 farmers said they produced more in 1942 than in 1941, 206 said their total production was the same and only 49 produced less. This is in agreement with an estimated 13 or 14 per cent greater agricultural production in 1942.

Favorable weather was an important factor in the large production attained in 1942. Then too, it will be recalled that 1942 production plans were made when the farm labor supply was still fairly adequate, and that planting and part of the summer's harvest work was done before the labor shortage began to be critical.

A number of factors other than the weather played a part in the greater production that was achieved in spite of a smaller labor supply. The following list (Table 6) is a summary of the farmers' replies in answer to the question, "If you produced more in 1942 with the same or a smaller labor supply, how was this accomplished?"

Table 6.- How 200 farmers produced more in 1942 with less labor, 16 Ohio areas -

<u>Item</u>	<u>Times reported</u>
Worked longer days	133
Wife, children and old folks worked more	69
Made more use of labor-saving machinery	66
Worked harder	36
Took better care of livestock	36
Changed crop production methods	32
Used more exchange labor	16
Neglected maintenance work	12
Farm handled by younger operator	10
Labor given greater interest in business	3

The neighborhood leaders who answered the above question listed, "Worked longer days." most often, followed in order by, "Used more labor-saving machinery; improved management and production practices; worked harder; wife, children and old folks worked more; and used more exchange labor."

One factor, the neglect of the physical plant -- buildings, fences, etc. -- was noticeable but it was not mentioned very often by the farmers, perhaps because their thoughts at the time were on the more pressing problems of wheat seeding, corn or soybean harvest, apple picking, and other hurry-up jobs.

Production record of 1942 difficult to match.- Farmers were not optimistic about their 1943 production. In the 16-county study only one out of eight farmers said that they would produce more in 1943 than in 1942; nearly half will produce the same as in 1942, 10 per cent will produce less, and another 31 per cent were uncertain about next year's production because of labor shortages or the impending draft of sons or other farm workers (Table 7). About 19 per cent of the farms had workers in October for whom induction seemed imminent. The final outlook for 1943 production will be greatly influenced by what happens on these farms, most of which will have a decreased production if these workers are inducted into the armed services. On the other hand, 34 of these 87 operators indicated they would produce a greater volume of farm products were their workers of draft status to remain on the farm, and the other 53 would do as well as in 1942.

Table 7.- Outlook for 1943 farm production compared with 1942, 16 Ohio counties.

	Western	North-eastern	South-eastern	Total	
	No.	No.	No.	No.	Pct.
Farms reporting	192	149	119	460	100.0
Will produce <u>more</u> *	28	20	10	58	12.6
Will produce <u>same</u> *	100	70	44	214	46.5
Will produce <u>less</u> *	16	12	18	46	10.0
<u>Uncertain</u> about 1943	48	47	47	142	30.9
Because of labor shortages	17	14	24	55	12.0
Because of impending draft of workers	31	33	23	87	18.9

* Farmers reporting that their 1943 production would equal or exceed that of 1942 assumed that weather conditions would be favorable and that necessary machinery repairs, gasoline, fertilizer, etc. would be available.

Those operators who indicated that they would produce more in 1943 were generally on farms that were smaller than the average (Table 8). Twenty of the 58 farms had less than 50 acres of cropland each. The farmers who are going to turn off a smaller volume of products in 1943 were on larger than average farms and had more livestock. This group had been hit hard by the movement of workers from their farms, having suffered a 16 per cent reduction in number of farm workers in the year ending October 1942.

Table 8.- Some measures of productive capacity of farms, grouped according to their 1943 farm production outlook.

1943 Outlook	Averages per farm, 1942							Percent decrease in	Percent of
	Number of farms	Acres of crop-land	Milk Cows	Beef Cows	Brood Sows	Hens	Months of labor	number of workers Oct. '41-'42	operators working off farm
More	58	78	7.3	0.7	3.6	118	17.0	6.2	36
Same	214	76	7.4	0.7	2.8	108	20.5	5.2	23
Less	46	97	8.8	7.2	3.7	110	23.6	15.8	15
Depends on labor	55	94	10.2	3.3	3.3	118	23.8	14.2	13
Depends on draft	87	120	10.8	2.7	3.9	148	26.8	5.2	9
Total reporting	460	89	8.5	2.0	3.3	117	21.9	7.5	20

Table 9.- Changes made in livestock production in 1942 and changes anticipated in 1943 livestock and crop production on farms of neighborhood leaders in Ohio

		Western Ohio		North- eastern Ohio		South- eastern Ohio		State total	
		More	Less	More	Less	More	Less	More	Less
Number of farmers reporting changes made in livestock in 1942:									
Hogs		347	24	194	20	118	4	659	48
Dairy		214	55	191	38	101	20	506	113
Poultry		84	6	75	8	47	3	206	17
Beef		87	21	49	7	31	2	167	30
Sheep		83	12	37	8	10	7	130	27
No change in 1942		374		261		181		816	
Total reporting		967		696		433		2096	
Number of farmers reporting changes anticipated in 1943:									
Hogs		158	12	77	2	36	2	271	16
Dairy		65	40	62	16	41	4	168	60
Poultry		24	5	29	2	21	0	74	7
Corn		26	18	34	8	30	6	90	32
Wheat		3	31	5	17	8	5	16	53
Soybeans		86	5	50	3	9	2	145	10
No change in 1943		420		309		210		939	
Total reporting		810		628		357		1795	
Anticipated changes in total production for 1943, by size of farm:									
Under 100 acres	More	29		44		35		108	
	Same	121		115		63		299	
	Less	21		30		17		68	
100 to 259 acres	More	93		77		71		241	
	Same	329		224		122		675	
	Less	103		83		60		246	
260 acres & over	More	35		23		23		81	
	Same	88		47		27		162	
	Less	56		25		23		104	
Total	More	157		144		129		430	
	Same	538		386		212		1136	
	Less	180		138		100		418	

The farmers who were in doubt concerning next year's production, and particularly those whose production depended on the disposition to be made of workers for whom induction appeared imminent, had the largest production possibilities of all. The latter group had farms a third larger than average (one-fourth had more than 150 acres of crop land each), they employed 22 per cent more labor than the average, and only 8 of the 87 operators were employed in nonfarm work.

The records secured from the neighborhood leaders reveal some interesting points in connection with 1943 agricultural production (Table 9). Note particularly the decline since 1942 in number of farmers reporting further increased dairy production, as compared with those who will increase the production of hogs.

The number who reported their total volume of production would be more in 1943 was practically the same as those who said they would produce less. At first glance this appears reasonably favorable. On closer examination it is found that many farmers who indicated an increase in production for 1943 were on smaller than average farms, and many of them were in the less productive areas of the State. On the other hand, many who said they would produce less were on the larger farms and were located in the more productive areas. For instance, 35 large farmers in western Ohio indicated an increase in production in 1943 as compared to 56 who foresaw a smaller total production on their farms. Will the increased production on small farms of eastern Ohio offset the decreased production on larger farms in the western part of the State?

Farmers experience with the Employment Service.- Only about 10 per cent of all farmers and 20 per cent of those who were handicapped by a shortage of farm labor in 1942 contacted their local U. S. Employment Service offices. Data from the neighborhood leader questionnaire is summarized in Table 10.

Table 10.- Experience of Ohio farm neighborhood leaders with the United States Employment Service, 1942.

	<u>Western</u>	<u>North- eastern</u>	<u>South- eastern</u>	<u>Total</u>
Total number of questionnaires returned	1038	767	505	2310
Reported handicapped by labor shortage in 1941	143	162	67	372
Reported handicapped by labor shortage in 1942	546	415	258	1219
Reported contacting U. S. Employment Service, 1942	110	98	41	249
Reported receiving help	43	35	12	90
Reported labor received as				
Satisfactory	8	6	5	19
Not very satisfactory	9	5	3	17
Unsatisfactory	23	23	4	50
No reply	3	1	-	4

That only a small proportion of those applying received satisfactory farm help was brought out in both studies. In the 16-county study a somewhat higher percentage received help, but this help was reported to have been unsatisfactory in nearly 60 per cent of the cases.

The farm housing situation.- Housing is generally a factor to be taken into account in farm labor discussions. Some preliminary data on the number of houses on the 477 farms and how they were used are shown in Table II. Additional data on number of farms having adequate housing facilities for hired help will be issued later. Many operators, whose son or unmarried hired man has left for the armed services or industry, will not be able to provide housing for married hired men, who now comprise a larger proportion of the regular hired labor supply.

Table II.- Housing on 477 farms, 16 Ohio counties, October 1942

	<u>Western</u>		<u>Northeastern</u>		<u>Southeastern</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	<u>Farms</u>	<u>Houses</u>	<u>Farms</u>	<u>Houses</u>	<u>Farms</u>	<u>Houses</u>	<u>Farms</u>	<u>Houses</u>
Total number	193	260	164	201	120	172	477	633
House occupied by operator	186	186	161	161	120	120	467*	467
Other houses	60	74	35	40	39	52	134	166
Occupied by owner	11	11	7	7	3	3	21	21
" by son, farming	9	10	9	10	3	3	21**	23
" by son, industry	2	2	3	3	1	1	6	6
" by farm labor	24	26	4	4	24	30	52	60
Rented to farm worker	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2
" to nonfarm worker	12	14	13	14	4	4	29	32
Vacant	9	9	2	2	11	11	22	22

* 10 operators lived off the farm, either in town, or on another tract outside the area and not included in the study.

** 51 additional households included married sons living with their parents.

Farm machinery.- This production factor is so closely associated with the farm labor situation that it seemed desirable to find out something about the machinery needs of farmers. More than 80 per cent of the farmers in the 16-county study said they could get along in 1943 with their present equipment, provided repairs are available when needed. With limited supplies of new machinery in 1943, every effort will have to be made to insure the maximum use of existing equipment. The extent to which some of the principal labor-saving machines are owned, and the extent to which these machines are used for custom work are shown in Table 12.

Table 12.- Machinery ownership and use on farms in Ohio, 1942

	<u>Sixteen county study</u>	<u>Neighborhood leader questionnaire</u>
Number of farms included	477	2254
Average size of farm, acres	151	183
Per cent of farmers owning		
Tractor	66.0	74.1
Combine	8.4	23.1
Pickup baler	1.0	2.5
Corn picker	6.7	10.8
Milking machine	13.6	17.3
Per cent of farmers using		
Combine	41.7	61.8
Pickup baler	10.9	24.8
Corn picker	22.6	39.5
Number of farms using per farm owning		
Combine	5.0	2.7
Pickup baler	10.9	9.8
Corn picker	3.4	3.7

A further analysis is being made of the machines which farmers would purchase first if such machines were available. This information will be issued later as a supplement to this report.

Fences and buildings.- The adequacy of these capital assets on individual farms has to be taken into account in appraising their production possibilities. How many farmers will not be able to fully utilize their pastures, and how much time will be wasted because of fence that will no longer turn livestock? How many farms do not have building space for more livestock, even though there be sufficient labor to take care of it? Data that may help in answering these and similar questions are given in Table 13.

Table 13.- Condition of fences and farm buildings, 16 Ohio areas.

	<u>Western</u>	<u>Northeastern</u>	<u>Southeastern</u>	<u>Total</u>
Answers to question: "Will shortage of fencing curtail your production in 1943?"				
Number of farms reporting	191	147	117	455
"Yes, fence seriously needed."	5	10	3	18
"Yes."	44	39	34	117
"Need barbed wire."	4	27	3	34
"No."	138	71	77	286
Answers to question: "Are buildings sufficient to handle more stock and poultry?"				
Number of farms reporting	190	155	117	462
"No."	91	57	50	198
"Some, but not all classes."	56	28	18	102
"Yes."	43	70	49	162

DAIRY PRODUCTION

- (1) The Crop Reporting Service showed 3 per cent more dairy cows 2 years old and over on Ohio farms on January 1, 1942, than on January 1, 1941.
- (2) In June they reported 4 per cent more cows than one year ago.
- (3) Our survey in 16 counties showed 1.5 per cent more dairy cows in milk on October 1, 1942, than on October 1, 1941.
- (4) Farm account records in Medina County show the same number of cows on Medina County farms during September and October, 1942, as one year ago.
- (5) The Crop Reporting Service reported the following on average number of cows per herd and average milk production per farm in Ohio:

	1941		1942	
	Cows	Milk production	Cows	Milk production
	No.	lbs.	No.	lbs.
September 1	7.38	124	7.60	128
October 1		119		125
November 1	7.43	112	7.47	110

It will be noted that in 1941 the number of cows per herd increased from September to November; in 1942 it decreased. The number per herd, however, was slightly larger in 1942 than in 1941.

- (6) The following figures on daily milk shipments per farm in the Cleveland area are published by the Milk Producers Federation:

	October				November			
	1st week	2nd week	3rd week	4th week	1st week	2nd week	3rd week	4th week
1941, lbs.	157	150	151	148	145	143	145	148
1942, lbs.	149	149	141	127	122	128	125	126

- (7) Federally inspected slaughter of cows and calves (both beef and dairy) in the United States during the first 10 months of 1942 was 17 per cent greater than in the corresponding period in 1941; in September, 1942, the number slaughtered was 30 per cent larger, and in October 34 per cent larger than the corresponding months of 1941.

- (8) The number of dairy heifers one to two years old in Ohio on January 1, 1942, was 20 per cent larger than the average for 1931-40; the number of heifer calves kept for milk cows was 22 per cent larger. This would indicate that there was available during 1942 more than the usual number of heifers to replace cows culled from herds.

- (9) A compilation of the cow sales at the Circleville, Ohio, livestock auction for the 14 weeks ending November 7, 1941 and 1942, is as follows:

	Number sold to farmers	Number sold to packers
1941	180	393
1942	175	397

(10) Summaries of about 50 Ohio dairy herd improvement associations show no material decrease in size of herds for the first 9 months of 1942.

	Cows sold per 100 in herd		Cows bought per 100 in herd
	For beef	For milk	
1st 9 months:			
1939	10.7	5.5	4.0
1940	10.3	6.2	3.9
1941	10.1	6.0	4.4
1942	10.3	6.0	3.7

(11) Stocks of dairy products in cold storage have been decreasing since September. On the fluid milk markets of the state an increasing per cent of the milk has been going into Class I uses. In October over 90 per cent of the receipts on several Ohio markets went into fluid milk and fluid cream uses.

U. S. Cold Storage Holdings

	Butter (lbs.)		Cheese (lbs)	
	1941	1942	1941	1942
June 1	56,792,000	64,797,000	102,869,000	195,999,000
July 1	120,246,000	117,652,000	121,064,000	228,399,000
August 1	178,493,000	148,637,000	139,568,000	260,187,000
September 1	200,228,000	152,037,000	151,906,000	245,358,000
October 1	202,957,000	123,599,000	156,746,000	221,344,000
November 1	186,635,000	87,037,000	157,468,000	169,663,000

(12) Farm auction sales advertisements carried in 32 representative rural daily and weekly newspapers in Ohio during August, September and October of 1941 and 1942 listed for sale 3,024 milk cows and bred heifers in 1941 and 5,793 in 1942, an increase of 91 per cent.

Conclusions

It would appear that since September 1 there has been no further increase in the number of cows milked; that at present net replacements are hardly sufficient to maintain the herds; that since October there has been a more than usual seasonal decline in milk production per cow; that the present shortage of milk as compared with one year ago is due to a greatly increased demand with no expansion in production. The unusually large number of farm sales would indicate that many experienced dairymen are going out of the dairy business. It has been suggested that the decline in milk production per cow since October 1 may be due in part to poorer care and to leaving the cattle on pasture longer than usual due to the labor shortage.

ANALYSIS OF FARM AUCTION SALES
Advertised in 32 Rural Papers during August, September and October
1941 and 1942

The number of farm auction sales advertised in 32 representative rural daily and weekly newspapers in Ohio during August, September and October in 1941 was 381.

In the same period in 1942 the same 32 papers carried notices of 655 farm auction sales or 72% more than in the same period in 1941.

In 1941 only 331 of the 381 or 87% of the farm auctions advertised carried sufficient detail as to items offered to make it possible to determine the number of milk cows and bred heifers offered for sale. In these 331 sales, 3,024 milk cows and bred heifers were offered, or an average of 9.1 per sale.

In 1942 only 575 of the 655, or 88% of the farm auctions advertised carried sufficient detail as to items offered to make it possible to determine the number of milk cows and bred heifers offered for sale. In these 575 sales, 5,793 milk cows and bred heifers were offered or an average of 10.1 per sale. Thus approximately 91% more milk cows and bred heifers were offered at farm auctions in 1942 than in 1941.

SUMMARY OF THE COUNTY FARM LABOR COMMITTEE SUGGESTIONS

It is one thing to determine the nature of the farm labor shortage and quite another problem to determine what should be done about it.

Eighty-seven Ohio counties have farm labor committees. These committees have been responsible for making two previous labor studies and have given serious thought to formulating plans to meet the situation. This reservoir of thinking and experience was again tapped for the present study. A list of nine specific questions was prepared and submitted to all 87 county farm labor committees, through the county agent, who serves as secretary to the committee.

This section of the report has been prepared from the replies of 66 county farm labor committees and is believed to represent a good cross-section of the thinking of all such committees. For purposes of tabulation and analysis, the reports were classified according to three principal agricultural areas in the State:

	<u>Western</u>	<u>North- eastern</u>	<u>South- eastern</u>	<u>Total</u>
Counties in area	40	21	27	88
Counties reporting	30	17	19	66
Per cent of counties reporting	75	81	70	75

A summary is given in the following order: (a) statement of the question, (b) the replies most frequently given, (c) a paragraph stating additional items mentioned in the committees' reports.

- (1) What plans should be developed for utilizing to the fullest extent the labor of school children?

	<u>Western</u>	<u>North- eastern</u>	<u>South- eastern</u>	<u>Total</u>
Number of county committees reporting:				
Shorten high school term for duration	21	9	5	35
Extend work permit system	12	6	8	26
Shorten interterm vacations	8	4	2	14
Curtail extra curricular activity	6	4	4	14
Shorten school day	4	3	4	11
Change system of distributing State funds	6	3	0	9

It was suggested a five-year high school course might be adopted if the school term is shortened. No suggestion was made to shorten the grade school term but that grade school pupils should be excused for work where necessary. Three committees opposed both shortening the school term and having a shorter school day. Teachers should give extra help to students excused for work. A question was raised relative to hiring school children for farm work under present labor laws. Athletics was the extra curricular activity most frequently mentioned for curtailment. In this connection it was stated that such curtailment would also save both gasoline and tires. It is significant that nine county committees even mentioned a change in the system of distributing State funds. Some committees suggested giving school credit for farm work. It was frequently stated that a program of registering and placement should be set up in the school.

- (2) If nonfarm children can be utilized, should there be some kind of a training period?

	<u>Western</u>	<u>North- eastern</u>	<u>South- eastern</u>	<u>Total</u>
Number of county committees reporting:				
Training needed	21	11	12	44
No training needed	8	4	4	16

Emphasis was given to the point that such training should be extremely practical and should be done on farms under actual farm conditions in so far as possible. It was pointed out repeatedly that nonfarm children would most likely be of assistance in areas of specialized crops, and could be used most successfully in small groups with supervisors.

- (3) What plans could be developed for using town people to help out at rush periods?

	<u>Western</u>	<u>North- eastern</u>	<u>South- eastern</u>	<u>Total</u>
Number of county committees reporting:				
Close stores part time	7	7	4	18
Get city groups to help	6	7	3	16
Register at Employment Service	6	4	3	13
Of little value	13	4	1	18

At least two committees reported a successful trial in the use of town people to harvest apples and potatoes. There was greatest optimism regarding the plan in areas where it had been tried. Many committees stated that the greatest pinch was during harvest, that harvest was heavy work during hot weather, and they doubted whether town people should be asked to do this type of work. It was emphasized that

such a program should be developed between farmers or farm groups and business, civic, and labor organizations.

- (4) To what extent may we expect an increasing participation in farm work by women?

	<u>Western</u>	<u>North- eastern</u>	<u>South- eastern</u>	<u>Total</u>
Number of county committees reporting:				
No increase	22	12	13	47
An increase	8	5	6	19

It was pointed out that nearly all farm women are already carrying an extremely heavy load of farm work. The duties of the farm home, with its relatively few modern conveniences, and the chores which the farm woman ordinarily performs often exceed the limit of her physical ability. Attention was called to the fact that with fewer doctors and nurses, farm women should, as a health measure, perform less farm work. It was noted that the average age of farm women in 1942 is higher than ever before and the average age is rapidly increasing, due to young people leaving the farm. Few suggestions were made relative to the use of nonfarm women on farms. In a few instances it was suggested that nonfarm women might help in farm homes, thus relieving farm women for field work. The transportation problem involved in such activity was emphasized. It was also mentioned that many nonfarm women are working in industry, taking the place of men in town and city jobs, civilian defense, and other vital work.

- (5) What has been the experience of your community in the securing of help from the Employment Service?

	<u>Western</u>	<u>North- eastern</u>	<u>South- eastern</u>	<u>Total</u>
Number of county committees reporting:				
No experience	7	2	1	10
Unsatisfactory	21	13	16	50
Satisfactory	1	2	1	4

All experiences of satisfactory help received were in special crop areas. Many workers sent to farms were unsatisfactory because they lacked experience, asked wages too high for the work performed, were sometimes unwilling to work, or were not at all dependable, working a few hours or days then quitting. Furthermore, many of these people were willing to accept farm work only as a last resort. Other points mentioned were that help was promised but never received, there was too much red tape, and that farmers had lost confidence in the Employment Service. Many committeemen had no actual experience with the Employment Service, but based their replies on observation in their neighborhoods. As a whole, the committeemen do not think there is much possibility of help from the United States Employment Service, except under limited conditions.

- (6) The experience of your community in 1942 with imported seasonal farm labor.

	<u>Western</u>	<u>North- eastern</u>	<u>South- eastern</u>	<u>Total</u>
Number of county committees reporting:				
No experience	9	11	16	36
Unsatisfactory	8	4	1	13
Satisfactory	13	2	1	16

On the whole, most of the experience with imported farm labor was in western Ohio, where it was fairly satisfactory. Expressions of dissatisfaction revolved around the points that some Mexicans left before the work was completed, that Kentuckians were generally valuable for hand work only, and that generally the help this year was not as good as heretofore. The point was made that such labor could never take the place of the farm boys that have gone into industry and the armed services.

(7) What has been the policy of the draft boards in your county toward farm labor?

	<u>Western</u>	<u>North- eastern</u>	<u>South- eastern</u>	<u>Total</u>
Number of county committees reporting:				
Fair	16	8	9	33
Unfair	11	5	3	19
Serious problem	3	3	7	13

Many committees stated that the attitude of the boards had changed recently to a more favorable policy toward agricultural workers but that irreparable damage had already been done in many cases. In general the committees thought that policies are made by the National Selective Service and that local boards have no alternative. Several committees frankly stated that local boards were giving little or no attention to agriculture as a necessary enterprise. On the other hand, several enumerated in detail the good working relationship between draft boards and labor committees. Committees were critical of the quota system. They stated that boards had to fill their quotas regardless of circumstances. Most committees expressed the belief that drafting additional farm labor will seriously affect the agricultural production program. The statement was frequently made that a thorough investigation should be made for each registrant located on a farm and that application for deferment should be made by committees where circumstances justify. Such procedure would relieve registrants of embarrassment.

(8) To what extent can the farm labor shortage be met by extending the practice of exchanging labor between farms?

	<u>Western</u>	<u>North- eastern</u>	<u>South- eastern</u>	<u>Total</u>
Number of county committees reporting:				
Already being used to full extent	15	5	3	23
Can be increased	15	5	13	33
Doubtful	0	7	3	10

The point was made that farm work is such that when there is a busy season on one farm the same is true on most farms. Exchanging work is most practical on small or part-time farms. Farm units and accompanying operations are rapidly becoming larger due to renting additional land. The larger the farm the greater the need for farm equipment. Power equipment is used to a maximum efficiency on large farms. The use of combines, corn pickers, hay balers, silo fillers, and threshers are about the only types of machinery that can be exchanged or custom used. There is danger of too much dependence on exchanging labor, as evidenced by the inability to get soybeans harvested this fall. Lack of tires, gasoline, and time are deterrents. Many men are working in war industries and farming at the same time. Exchange labor cannot be used to milk cows, feed hogs, care for poultry, and do the other work necessary to increase production of vital livestock and livestock products.

(9) Further comments on the farm labor shortage and ways of meeting it.

	<u>Western</u>	<u>North- eastern</u>	<u>South- eastern</u>	<u>Total</u>
Number of county committees reporting:				
Adequate farm prices	8	7	11	26
Freeze farm labor	16	4	6	26
Ration farm machinery	7	8	3	18
Increase work hours in industry	5	2	8	15
Eliminate WPA	2	0	8	10
Eliminate war time	2	2	0	4
Lower factory wages	2	0	2	4

Many committees thought that having farm prices sufficiently high to enable farmers to compete with industry for labor would do more to relieve the farm labor situation than anything else. Freezing of farm labor also ranked high, especially in western Ohio. Attractive industrial wages have drained manpower from the farm. Moreover, the policy that each local draft board must meet quotas from whatever manpower is left places a particularly serious drain on farm workers. The committees stated that the skilled workers left cannot operate the farms at desirable efficiency. Inability to get equipment and repairs quickly is a cause of wasted labor. The committees thought that if industrial working hours per week were increased, workers would be released for farms. It is interesting to note that eight committees in southeastern Ohio suggested elimination of WPA. It was stated that at least one farmer should be on every rural draft board. The statement was frequently made that farmers are rapidly assuming the attitude that they are going to plan only what they can do without extra help. The age of the average operator is such that he cannot continue to work long hours because of a health hazard. Committees pointed out that inability to get wire fence, roofing, and other repair materials is requiring much extra work to keep fences and buildings in repair, thus limiting time available for production. It was also emphasized that farm machinery is a year older each succeeding year, thus requiring extra time to keep it in repair.

THE UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

In August, 1942, the United States Employment Service reported offices at 109 points in Ohio. Of these, 20 were classed as seasonal farm offices, 52 as Employment Security Centers, 16 as local branch offices and 21 as itinerate points.

In July of 1942 employment offices in Ohio reported the placing of 3,564 workers on Ohio farms, of these 53 were on dairy farms. In August, 4,154 were placed, of which 52 were on dairy farms. In our study information relating to the use of the Employment Service by farm operators was secured from three sources: the County Labor Committees, the 16-county sample study and the neighborhood leaders. The County Labor Committees were asked the question, "What has been the experience of your community in the securing of help from the United States Employment Service?" Their answers are summarized below:

	<u>Western</u>	<u>North- eastern</u>	<u>South- eastern</u>	<u>Total</u>
Number of county committees reporting:				
No experience	7	2	1	10
Unsatisfactory	21	13	16	50
Satisfactory	1	2	1	4

In the personal interviews in 16 counties the following questions were asked: "Did you contact the local Employment Service this year?" "Did you secure help through it?" "Was it satisfactory?" The answers are given below:

No. of farms interviewed	477
Short of labor in 1941	58
Short of labor in 1942	213
Contacted Employment Service	48
Secured help	26
Help was satisfactory	11
Help was not satisfactory	15

On the mailed questionnaire 2,310 Ohio farmers answered the same questions:

No. of farms reporting	2,310
Short of labor in 1941	372
Short of labor in 1942	1,219
Contacted Employment Service	249
Secured help	90
Help was satisfactory	19
Help was not satisfactory	50
Help was not very satisfactory	17
No reply	4

In general it could be said that about one-half of the farmers needed help, ten per cent of the farmers had contacted the Employment Service for help, about five per cent had secured help, and about 3 per cent had secured help that was satisfactory. It was evident from the replies that most farmers are skeptical about securing help from the Employment Service. Where they had not tried the Employment Service themselves they had usually heard unsatisfactory reports from others. The securing of regular farm help was less satisfactory than seasonal help. It would seem that experienced farm hands seldom register with the Employment Service.

On the other hand, there were many instances encountered where the Employment Service had been of great assistance in the securing of help for such jobs as picking fruit, picking apples, vegetable growing and harvesting, etc. In Lorain County much help was secured through the Employment Service when industrial workers after their days work in the city worked extra time on the farms. Many vegetable growers reported favorable experience in the employment of women and school children through the Employment Service. Our findings would probably reflect more the experience of the livestock and general farmer than that of the fruit and vegetable grower.

HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS AS A SOURCE OF FARM LABOR SUPPLY

The inventory of manpower in Ohio as provided by the 1940 Census indicates that one of the largest potential labor reserves in the State consists of young people 14 years old and over who were attending school. That Census enumerated 92,000 farm boys and girls, 93,000 rural nonfarm boys and girls, and 360,000 urban boys and girls 14-24 years of age attending school, a total of 545,000 students.

The great majority of students of working age who are in school are under 18 years of age. In 1940 about 80 per cent of all those school attendants 14-24 years old were of high school ages, 14-17 years. These young students of high school age numbered 429,000 for the State as a whole. Of these 276,000 lived in urban places, 77,000 lived in rural nonfarm homes, and 76,000 lived in rural farm homes according to Census classification. Numerically these students would comprise a very large farm labor reserve. There are, however, definite legal and ethical limitations upon the mobilization of children under 18 years of age for meeting farm labor shortages.

- (1) The compulsory school age in Ohio includes children up to 18 years, but school superintendents may issue age and schooling certificates to those who have reached their sixteenth birthday and have completed at least 7 grades in school, permitting them to work in approved occupations.
- (2) The limitations and possibilities pertaining to the adjustment of school programs to allow more effective farm employment of older boys and girls attending school are several in number:
 - (a) Local school boards regulate the opening and closing dates of the public schools, but the law requires 180 days in session for full participation in the state school foundation program.
 - (b) Schools might operate 6 days each week and thus accumulate the 180 days in a shorter time interval, thereby setting an earlier than usual adjournment date.
 - (c) A school might eliminate its spring and Christmas vacations and thereby gain 2 or 3 weeks which could be applied to a later starting date or to an earlier closing date.
 - (d) A local board might shorten the school term to less than 180 days, the legal minimum being 160 days. If such a local board did shorten the term to less than 180 days, there would be no financial loss in State aid to the board the first year of the shortened term, for it would receive from the foundation apportionment exactly in proportion to its average daily attendance during the preceeding year. During the second and succeeding years the board would lose a part of its State aid however, since the foundation apportionment for a given year is based on average daily attendance of the preceeding year.
 - (e) The State Department of Education, under terms of the General Code, specifies that a superintendent may grant to a child over 14 years of age in his district a 5-day release from school for farm work directly and exclusively for his parents or legal guardians. This release may be renewed two successive times for a total of 15 days during a school term. During his release from school under this regulation the child will not be considered in attendance for purposes of apportioning foundation program funds.

(f) It has been suggested that the basis of allocating State funds to local schools under the foundation program be modified for the duration to allow school boards to shorten the school term to less than 180 days in instances where acute farm labor requirements might demand such action, and in order that more temporary absences from school for farm work might be allowed without thereby reducing the school's apportionment from the foundation program funds. At present the allotment for each successive year is based on the number of pupils in average daily attendance during the preceding year. The suggestion is that during each war year the apportionments be made on the basis of average daily attendance during the last pre-war year, 1940-1941. In other words, the basis for making the present year's allotments would be frozen for the duration of the war. This change would however, require legislative action.

Reference to the above discussion indicates four possibilities for greater use of high school boys and girls in farm jobs when their service is needed:

- (1) There is the possibility of shortening the period between opening and closing dates for schools by continuing the sessions on Saturdays and on holidays, by reducing the term below the present standard of 180 days, or by both of these methods.
- (2) There is the possibility of making greater use of the regulations under which superintendents in rural areas may excuse pupils 14 years old and over for limited periods of farm work for their families.
- (3) There is the further possibility, not previously mentioned, of shortening the school day of high school pupils needed in farm work by excusing them from attendance before the end of the regular afternoon session.
- (4) There is the possibility of issuing age and schooling certificates to those 16 or 17 years old who have completed at least 7 grades, permitting them to enter full-time employment in agriculture. Such interruptions in children's school programs should be made only in cases of critical farm labor shortages which cannot be met in any other way.

Safeguarding Young Workers in Agriculture

Much of the farm work performed by young people under 18 years is performed by children of farm operators who work under the direct supervision of their own parents or guardians. As this year's crops matured youths not previously employed in agriculture were recruited as emergency workers on farms, and many farm youths of school age were called upon to work away from home as hired farm laborers. The demand for high school youths, both rural and urban, to serve as emergency hired workers in agriculture is likely to be much greater for planting, cultivating, and harvesting next year's crops. It is generally agreed that farm employment for these young people, if well planned and supervised, can be made beneficial to the young people themselves as well as productive for the farmers who will need their help. In order to insure that farm employment of young workers will contribute both to agricultural production and to the well-being of the youths as well, it is highly advisable that certain basic principles and standards be established for their employment.

Fortunately the Children's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor has already given careful consideration to the matter of safeguarding young workers in wartime agriculture. That agency in cooperation with representatives of other public and private agencies interested in agricultural production and in the education, health, and welfare of children, has prepared a statement of standards for the recruitment, placement, and supervision of youth under 18 years old, as an emergency farm labor force during the war. Following is a condensed summary of those standards:

- (1) Age limitations as follows: A minimum of 14 years for hired farm labor; 16 years if the worker is placed to live away from his family.
- (2) Protection of educational opportunity for youth attending school by (a) employing pupils of 16 and 17 years during school hours, only if no older workers are available; (b) limiting employment of pupils 14 and 15 years to work during vacation or outside school hours, with no release from school or modification of school programs unless the need can be met in no other practicable way.
- (3) Precautionary measures before placement, particularly for those who will live away from their families: Written parental consent, documentary evidence of age, physical examination, and appropriate immunizations.
- (4) Measures to promote morale and general welfare: (a) Suitable placement of individuals selected; (b) preparation for work; (c) adequate supervision of the young persons while at work and, where they are living away from their families, supervision of camp life or other living arrangements, and provision for recreational activities and community relationships, including church contacts.
- (5) Protection of health and safety by (a) adequate sanitary facilities; (b) good living conditions and adequate diet for workers placed in camps or farm homes; (c) availability of medical and hospital services; (d) protection against accidents; (e) payment of expenses in case of injury; (f) safe transportation to and from work.
- (6) Good working conditions, including: (a) Wages not less than those paid to older workers for comparable work; (b) hours for minors under 18 not more than 8 a day (6-hour day is desirable for children of 14 and 15), and not more than 6 days a week (except for morning and evening chores on the seventh day); (c) provision for rest and lunch periods; (d) total absence from home or living quarters not to exceed 10 hours daily, including travel to and from work.
- (7) Full compliance with State and Federal child labor laws and State compulsory school attendance laws, as well as with the statement, Policies of Recruitment of Young Workers for Wartime Agriculture, prepared by the Children's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor, and approved by the United States Office of Education, the United States Department of Agriculture, and the United States Employment Service.
- (8) Acceptance by State and local committee, representing public and private agencies interested in youth and in farm production, of responsibility for developing programs and carrying out standards for the protection of young workers. Executive authority should be delegated to designated agencies or persons, with the assistance of qualified staff.

The statement of policies on recruitment of young workers for wartime agriculture, mentioned above, has been summarized as follows:

(1) All plans for the use of young workers should be developed as part of broad programs for meeting the needs of agricultural labor based on consideration of all available sources of labor and the wages and working conditions offered to adults.

(2) State departments or agencies dealing with education, labor, health and agriculture should participate in the development of policies regarding the recruitment of young workers and the possible modification of school programs, and in the application of these policies to local situations.

(3) Proposals for employment of young workers during normal school terms should be approved only after the Farm Placement Service of the U.S.E.S. determines, on the basis of full information on the labor situation, that the anticipated need for labor cannot be filled by older persons resident in the locality or reasonably available from outside the locality.

(4) In recruiting young people from school when a real need for agricultural workers has been found to exist --

(a) Youth 16 years old and over should be engaged before children aged 14 and 15 are called upon; the schools should make every effort to develop programs that will wisely dovetail school activities with agricultural work and will result in no curtailment of school terms.

(b) Children 14 and 15 years of age should not be released from school nor their school program modified unless it is found that the need for farm labor is an essential one and cannot be met in any other practicable way; in such case adjustment in school attendance and programs should be arranged to interfere as little as possible with normal school opportunities and progress.

(c) School work and home duties should constitute the only work of children under 14 years of age; and such children should not be employed in agriculture outside the home farm.

(5) When young people are placed in agricultural work, provisions should be made for safeguarding their health and welfare through reasonable hours of work; wages at not less than established prevailing rates; safe and suitable transportation where needed; and, for those living away from home, provisions for fully adequate housing accommodations, supervision, medical care, and leisure time activities.

RESERVE LABOR SUPPLY AMONG AGED PEOPLE IN OHIO

At the time of the 1940 Census, there were in Ohio 540,000 old people 65 years of age and over. Of these, 260,000 were aged men and 280,000 were aged women. The labor reserve represented by these aged people was limited for many were employed at the time the Census was taken and many others were unable to work.

Of the 260,000 aged men 65 years old and over in Ohio in 1940, about 40 per cent were in the labor force, and were either working or seeking work; approximately 40,000 were operating farms. An additional two-fifths reported that they were unable to work due to the feebleness of old age, chronic illness, or permanent disability and 3 per cent were inmates of institutions including prisons, mental institutions, and old peoples homes. The remainder, about 17 per cent, were not working or seeking work for other reasons, or their occupational status was not determined.

Careful study of the 1940 Census reports indicates that there were around 40,000 aged men in Ohio who were not in the labor force and who were not reported as unable to work or in institutions. Not all of these retired aged men could be recruited for farm labor however, for the majority were probably urban residents without farm experience and without the physical fitness to withstand strenuous farm work on a full-time basis. These aged men do however, comprise a reserve from which much seasonal and part-time farm labor might be drawn. This would be especially true of those able bodied old men with previous farm experience or who had retired from farming.

Possibilities of drawing aged women, not now on farms, into farm jobs are also limited. There is the possibility however, that some physically fit aged women, especially those with farm experience, might aid in harvesting certain types of crops or in performing other farm tasks suitable to their age and abilities. They might for example, aid by doing the work of regular farm homemakers at times when those homemakers were needed to perform farm work outside their homes.

At the time of the 1940 Census only about 5 per cent of all aged women 65 years old and over were in the regular labor force, though 57 per cent were engaged in doing their own home housework. About 29 per cent were reported as unable to work and 3 per cent were in institutions. The remainder were not in the labor force for other reasons or their occupational status was not determined.

Recipients of Old Age Assistance in Ohio

In October 1942 there were 138,700 old people 65 years old and over receiving aid to the aged under the State - Federal Old Age Assistance Program in Ohio. Under this program, administered by the State Department of Public Welfare, needy old people 65 years old and over receive on the basis of their subsistence needs monthly grants which now average between 25 and 30 dollars per recipient. The maximum grant is 40 dollars per month or 480 dollars per year, but the actual amount of the payment to an individual depends on the deficiency of whatever independent income (if any) he may have for meeting his actual subsistence needs. None of these recipients are, therefore, regularly employed at jobs which remunerate them to the extent of \$480 per year, the maximum assistance grant.

To what extent do these so-called old age pensioners comprise a potential farm labor reserve? Answer to this question will depend upon several considerations including the age and physical fitness of the recipients, their location relative to farm labor needs, and the administrative limitations upon the amount of wages recipients can receive from employment without losing their status as recipients of old age assistance payments.

Administrative regulations of the Federal Social Security Board, through which federal funds are allocated to match state funds for old age assistance, do not allow a recipient to be engaged in regular full-time employment and at the same time receive aid from those funds. The regulations are sufficiently flexible however, so that during the war emergency recipients may engage in irregular, periodic jobs and receive remuneration for such jobs without losing their assistance status and without causing a reduction in the amount of their assistance grants. Farmers may, therefore, hire these clients from time to time to help out in busy periods at such farm jobs as they may be fitted to do and recipients may engage in such work and still receive the same old age assistance benefits. Such employment might be on an hourly, daily, or weekly basis and for such intervals as may be determined upon by the Department of Public Welfare.

Recipients may of course accept full-time regular employment in such instances where they feel justified in relinquishing their old age assistance payments permanently or temporarily. A recipient of an assistance grant might accept regular part-time employment for room and board. In such case the value of that room and board would then be deducted from his assistance grant.

In addition to the administrative considerations mentioned above, there are other limitations to the employment of old age assistance clients. One limitation is to be found in the age and sex composition of the recipients. Of the 138,700 clients on the rolls in October, a little more than half (51 per cent) were women, the men numbering about 68,000. The median age of all of these clients was 74 years. It is not likely that any appreciable number of farm helpers may be recruited even for part-time work from among the half of the recipients who are 74 years old and over. Moreover a considerable proportion of those 65-74 years old will not be able to work. For example, among the 20,000 recipients accepted during the fiscal year, 1939-1940, it was found that 13.5 per cent were bed-ridden or were otherwise unable to care for themselves, though 82 per cent were less than 75 years of age. These aged recipients represent the lowest income level of the population. Within this income level the incidence of illness and disability is greatest.

Another limitation to recruitment of old age assistance clients for irregular farm work is imposed by difficulties that are apt to be encountered in transporting such workers to the places where they will be needed. About 38 per cent of the recipients are located in the 8 metropolitan counties of Ohio: Cuyahoga, Franklin, Hamilton, Lucas, Mahoning, Montgomery, Stark, and Summit. An additional 22 per cent were located in counties of southeastern Ohio, leaving only 40 per cent in the western and northeastern areas of the State outside the 8 large metropolitan counties.

Further estimates of residence location of old age assistance recipients indicate that 32 per cent live in cities of 100,000 and over, and 27 per cent live in incorporated places of 2,500 - 100,000. In other words 59 per cent live in these urban places. The remaining 41 per cent reside in rural areas, 25 per cent being farm residents and 16 per cent being residents in rural nonfarm homes. Some of the recipients, living on farms, operate small acreages from which they produce a part

of their living but receive supplementary assistance grants. Others are fully retired and live with relatives or in separate retirement homes.

It is likely that many of these recipients who live on farms or in small towns and villages adjacent to farming areas where their help may be needed might benefit from irregular farm work suited to their abilities. Through such work they might be made to feel that they too are making contributions to the war effort and their work might be productive for the farmers who employ them.

It would appear that nearly 10,000 male recipients of old age pensions with farm experience should be available for more or less farm work.

WPA EMPLOYEES AS A SOURCE OF FARM LABOR IN OHIO

Public emergency workers employed on projects financed from WPA funds do not comprise any appreciable source of manpower for meeting farm labor or other war needs in Ohio. At the beginning of 1941 more than 100,000 persons were employed under the WPA program in this State. By October 6, 1942, the WPA case load had dropped to only 17,589 employees as a result of shifts to private employment.

Of the 17,589 WPA employees on October 6, 6,130 were women and only 11,459 were men. Including both men and women project workers, these employees were concentrated in the large metropolitan counties and in the southeastern counties of Ohio. About 57 per cent were located in the following counties: Cuyahoga, Franklin, Hamilton, Lucas, Mahoning, Montgomery, Stark and Summit. About two-thirds of those employees outside these urban areas were in those counties comprising southeastern Ohio. In other words, 9,941 were in the eight metropolitan counties, 5,148 were in the southeastern counties and only 2,500 were in the other counties of western and northeastern Ohio where farm manpower needs presumably are greatest.

WPA officials have pursued a vigorous farm placement program, have referred thousands of men to farm employers. Such referrals have been made under carefully devised regulations and guiding principles regarding wages, working conditions and regarding the dovetailing of temporary farm jobs with public project employment. It is recognized that at present the pool of WPA workers employable as farm laborers is about exhausted. The average age of project workers is 55 to 56 years. All workers who had 5 or more acres of tillable farm land have been removed from WPA rolls. Few workers remaining have farm experience and few are physically fit for the strenuous work usually required of farm hands. Moreover, it appears probable that most of those who might be successfully placed in farm jobs live outside the areas of greatest farm labor needs.

